

# IN THE COURT OF THE TRANSPORT TRIBUNAL

## LONDON FARES AND MISCELLANEOUS CHARGES DIVISION

1964 No. 4

In the matter of the London Fares (London Transport) Orders 1963 and 1964  
London Transport Board

Applicants

### Reasons for Decision of the Tribunal

This application for an Order under s.45 of the Transport Act, 1962 (hereafter referred to as "the Act") to replace the London Fares (London Transport) Orders, 1963 and 1964 was made on 7th August 1964. At that date the Applicants had increased their charges in accordance with the special procedure for the temporary authorisation of increased maximum charges contained in s.48 of the Act, the increases dating from 19th July 1964.

The application has amended to it a draft Order which, in addition to making permanent the increased maximum charges temporarily authorised under s.48 of the Act, permits further increases in the fares on the Applicants' railways. These further increases are consequential upon the application made by the British Railways Board (1964 No. 3) on the same day.

On 19th December, 1963, this Tribunal made the London Fares (London Transport) Order, 1963, fixing maximum charges which were expected to produce a surplus, after expenses and interest had been met, of £3.6m. By that time the financial picture which had been presented to us in the inquiry which we held before making the Order had been materially altered, for on 18th December increases in the pay of drivers and conductors took effect. In the same month increases were granted to the Applicants' railway staff. The total effect of these increases, together with some smaller increases which had come into effect earlier, would have been to produce in a full year an estimated revenue deficit of £0.2m. instead of the surplus previously estimated.

In order to meet this position the Applicants applied for, and we made, the London Fares (London Transport) Order 1963 (Variation) Order 1964, dated 23rd June 1964, fixing some further increased maximum charges, which it was estimated would produce a surplus of £2.3m. in a future year.

Unfortunately the estimate then made has turned out to be unduly optimistic. In consequence of adverse factors which have been operating during the year 1964 upon both sides of the revenue and expenditure account, the charges fixed by the two Orders will not produce the estimated surplus of £2.3m., but are estimated to result in a deficit of £2.7m.

It is estimated that the increased maximum charges temporarily authorised under s.48 of the Act would yield £5.64m., and that the further increases consequential upon the application made by the British Railways Board would yield £0.05m. Rounding up to £5.7m., it is therefore estimated that the deficit of £2.7m. could be converted into a surplus at the rate of £3m. It is not, however, expected that such a surplus will actually be achieved, because the Applicants will be faced with meeting the cost of further improvements in the pay and conditions of service of their employees between now and next July.

The most disturbing feature of the situation is that, notwithstanding the increases in fares, there has been a decline in the gross passenger receipts at the rate of £3.3m. in a full year. At first sight this might appear to have been brought about by the resistance of the public to the increased fares, in which event no amelioration of the Applicants' position could be expected from still further increases in fares. This was suggested to be the correct interpretation of the figures by Mr. Calvoresani, who appeared for the Chesham Urban District Council, and by Mr. Egelzick, who addressed us on behalf of the London District Committee of the Communist Party. On closer investigation this turned out not to be the case. During the first twenty-four weeks of the year 1964 the Applicants' passenger traffic receipts had fallen short of their estimates by £1.14m. However, an analysis made by Mr. R. M. Robbins, the Applicants' Chief Commercial and Public Relations Officer, disclosed that this was not due to a general decline in traffic over the whole of the Applicants' undertaking. It had been caused by a shortfall of £1.64m. on their road services, which had been

partially off-set by an increase of £0.5m. on their railways. Had the decline been due to passenger resistance, one would have expected to find it on all the services.

The explanation put forward by the Applicants, which seems to be consistent with the figures, was that the road services had permanently lost passengers as the result of a ban on working overtime by their operating staff during the autumn of 1963, which had caused a change in the travelling habits of members of the public, some transferring their patronage to the Applicants' railways, some to the railways of the British Railways Board, and others abandoning public transport altogether. It was also suggested that some of the decline in receipts could be attributed to a tendency to live nearer to work or to work nearer to home, so shortening the daily journey to work, and some of it to the adoption of a five-day week in some London shops.

After the matter had been investigated during the inquiry before us, Mr. Goff, who appeared for the County Councils of London, Middlesex and Surrey, stated that his clients did not feel that it would be right to oppose confirmation of the increases made under s.48 of the Act. We are satisfied that this was a proper course to take.

When announcing this decision of his clients, Mr. Goff invited us to take one of two courses, namely, either to say in our decision that, having regard to the evidence, we are now satisfied, notwithstanding the matters which weighed with us in the earlier proceedings, that the proper surplus to discharge the Applicants' statutory financial duty cannot exceed £2m.; or, alternatively, to make it clear that our decision in the earlier proceedings related only to the circumstances as they then were and, having regard to the evidence, it is now open to consideration whether the figure of £2m. should not be revised and to what extent it ought to be revised.

On these matters we say nothing, save to observe that when considering any future application under the Act it will be our duty under s.45(4) and 46(4) of the Act to take into account the Applicants' then present circumstances and future prospects, as disclosed by the evidence at the public inquiry which it will be our duty to hold under s.45(6).

We turn now to consider the matters which remained in dispute at the end of the inquiry, namely the further increases in fares consequential upon the application made by the British Railways Board. These increases were the application of the British Railways scale of charges to the line from Bow Road to Upminster; the application of the further increases in season ticket rates sought by the British Railways Board to the line from Harrow-on-the-Hill to Amersham, with its two branches to Watford and Chesham, and to the line from Queen's Park to Watford Junction, and to the line from Bow Road to Upminster; and the abolition of day return tickets. The application of the British Railways scale of charges to the line from Bow Road to Upminster would be an innovation: the fares on the other lines have always been at the then current British Railways level.

The proposal to apply the British Railways scale of charges to the line from Bow Road to Upminster is consequential upon the application by the British Railways Board to apply to their Fenchurch Street lines their general scale of fares instead of the London Transport scale of fares, which has applied to those lines since 1950. Having decided upon the British Railways Board's application not to alter the present position with regard to their Fenchurch Street Lines, it follows that this part of this application should be refused.

Having decided to refuse the British Railways Board's application that their season ticket rates should be increased beyond those of the Applicants, it follows that there can be no justification for permitting the Applicants to charge the increased season ticket rates on the lines to which the British Railways scales of ordinary fares are applied.

Having decided to allow the British Railways Board's application to abolish day return tickets, it follows that we ought also to allow the part of the Applicants' application relating to such tickets. It seems to us that the reasons for abolishing day return tickets on the lines of the Applicants and the British Railways Board are indistinguishable.

In addition to the maximum charges already referred to, the application also invited us to include in the Order paragraphs authorising the making of such charges as may be reasonable in respect of the carriage of passengers—

- (1) by any vehicle specially constructed or adapted for the carriage of more than the normal number of standing passengers; and
- (2) by any vehicle not ordinarily in general use by the Board, or by any vehicle the method of operation of which (including staffing and the collection of fares) is not ordinarily in general use by the Board for the carriage of passengers by stage carriage services or the London coach services.

We were informed that the object of these proposals was to enable the Applicants to experiment with new methods for the transport of passengers in congested areas and at busy times. The only concrete proposal of which we were told was one to use six single-decker omnibuses of a new type designed to carry an increased number of standing passengers on the busy route between Victoria and Marble Arch. What is desired is to experiment with a first-rate fare, which will probably be higher than the maximum for the route, in order to see whether it will be attractive to people who want to get taken quickly, although standing, from one point to another.

It appears to us that this object could be attained without the inclusion in the Order of the second proposed paragraph. We were given no information as to the type of service which it is contemplated might be operated under this paragraph, and we were told that the Applicants do not attach much importance to it.

So far as the first proposed paragraph relating to standing passengers is concerned, it was urged upon us by Mr. Goff that we ought to fix maximum charges instead of leaving the Applicants to make reasonable charges, subject to the decision of this Tribunal as to their reasonableness. Mr. Goff further contended that in any event the Applicants ought to be required to provide an adequate alternative service at normal fares.

We are required by s.45(3)(a) of the Act to fix maximum charges, except in cases where it appears not to be reasonably practicable or to be undesirable so to do. In such cases we are empowered by s.45(3)(b) to authorise the making of such charges as may be reasonable. Having regard to the experimental nature of the proposed service using vehicles of a kind which have never before been used in the London Area, we do not consider that it is reasonably practicable for us to fix maximum charges until the service has been operated experimentally.

As for the suggestion that we should only allow the Applicants to charge for the use of their experimental vehicles subject to a proviso that they should provide an adequate alternative service at normal fares, our only powers are those conferred upon us by the Act, and those powers do not include one of requiring the Applicants to operate services. The Applicants' only obligation to operate services is the general duty imposed upon them by s.7 of the Act.

After considering the wording of the paragraph relating to standing passengers in the light of the Public Service Vehicles and Trolley Vehicles (Carrying Capacity) Regulations, 1954 (S.I. 1954 No. 1612), we have come to the conclusion that it should be redrafted in the following terms—

"by any vehicle specially constructed or adapted for the purpose of carrying standing passengers and authorised for that purpose under regulation 6 of the Public Service Vehicles and Trolley Vehicles (Carrying Capacity) Regulations, 1954".

Finally it was suggested that this provision should only be allowed for a limited period. Without expressing any view on the question whether we have jurisdiction to make an order or part of an order to operate for a limited period, we do not consider that that would be a proper course to take in this instance. The only effect of limiting the operation of the clause to a certain time would be that upon the expiration of that time there would be no provision in the Order as respects the charges in question, and the result would be that those charges would be left to the unfettered discretion of the Applicants under paragraph 24 of the Order, which we are required to include in it by virtue of s.45(3)(c) of the Act.

G. D. SQUIRE,  
T. B. ROSSON,  
R. C. MOORE.

22nd January 1965.

## THE LONDON FARES (LONDON TRANSPORT) ORDER 1965

### DAILY PROCEEDINGS

#### CORRECTIONS

##### FIRST DAY

Monday, 30th November, 1964

- Page 1, column 1, paragraph 4, line 1—for "Sir: In" read "Sir, in"  
 Page 2, column 1, paragraph 4, line 4—for "railway agent" read "British Railways"  
 Page 2, column 1, paragraph 4, penultimate line—for "£5.67m" read "£5.69m"  
 Page 2, column 2, lines 6, 7, 8—for "the Board . . . fares" read "the Board, or by any vehicle the method of operation of which (including staffing and collection of fares)"  
 Page 3, column 1, question 7, line 4—for "Mr. Calvoresini" read "Mr. Calvoresini"  
 Page 3, column 2, question 13, line 4—for "fourteen weeks of 1963" read "forty weeks of 1964"  
 Page 4, column 2, question 37, line 1—after "June" insert "1963"  
 Page 5, column 1, question 52, line 1—for "year" read "year"  
 Page 5, column 1, question 59, line 4—for "first years" read "first year"  
 Page 5, column 2, question 64, line 2—for "that is the surplus shown" read "that is the working surplus, before interest charges, shown"  
 Page 5, column 2, question 70, line 5—for "reduced" read "renewed"  
 Page 6, column 1, question 77, line 5—for "later" read "better"

##### SECOND DAY

Tuesday, 1st December, 1964

- Page 7, column 2, line 6—for "precedent" read "precedent"  
 Page 8, column 1, question 99, line 4—for "still reason" read "still reasonable"  
 Page 8, column 2, question 115, line 3—for "on" read "of"  
 Page 9, column 1, question 127, line 3—after "soory" insert "?"  
 Page 9, column 2, question 143, line 3—for "labour warch" read "labour awards"  
 Page 9, column 2, question 145, line 2—for "trade in" read "trade in"  
 Page 10, column 1, question 154, line 2—for "They were to" read "They would"  
 Page 10, column 1, question 160, line 1—for "December 1st" read "December 1st 1964"  
 Page 11, column 1, question 193, line 5—for "in November" read "since November"  
 Page 11, column 2, question 200, line 7—for "I disagree entirely because" read "I disagree entirely. Because"

Page 12, column 1, question 215, line 2—for "next year" read "X" year "

Page 12, column 2, question 228, line 7—for "It is still an aggregate; there" read "It is still an aggregate even if there "

Page 12, column 2, question 235, line 3—for "the final cost" read "the further cost "

Page 12, column 2, question 239, line 3—for "it" read "is "

Page 12, column 2, question 241, line 5—for "Perrington" read "Tarrington "

Page 13, column 1, question 248, line 8—for "necessary" read "necessary "

Page 13, column 2, question 260, line 2—for "included in" read "including "

Page 14, column 1, question 290, line 2—for "£400,000" read "£200,000 "

Page 15, column 2, question 322, line 10—for "which formally" read "which was formerly "

Page 16, column 1, question 327, line 17—for "certainly" read "certainly "

Page 16, column 2, question 335, line 2—for "railway" read "road services "

Page 18, column 1, question 380, line 3—for "as page 6" read "at page 6 "

Page 18, column 2, question 388, line 6—delete "at" at beginning of line

Page 19, column 1, question 405, line 4—for "is that no right" read "is that not right "

Page 19, column 1, question 407, line 4—for "surplus" read "surplus "

Page 20, column 1, question 425, line 23—after "sub-section 8" read "Transport Act, 1962 "

Page 21, column 1, question 427a, lines 10 and 11—for "regrettably" read "regrettably "

Page 21, column 2, question 430, line 5—for "1964" read "1965 "

Page 22, column 1, question 435, line 6—for "regrettably" read "regrettably "

Page 23, column 2, question 448, line 3—for "later" read "later "

Page 24, column 1, question 452, line 2—for "here" read "higher "

Page 24, column 2, question 472, lines 1 and 2—for "is it? That will cost another—Another quarter" read "is it?—That will cost another quarter "

Page 24, column 2, question 472, line 4—delete "year "

Page 25, column 1, question 489, line 2—for "to" read "of "

Page 26, column 1, question 509, line 5—for "show 50-4m" read "show minus 50-4m "

Page 26, column 1, question 509, line 6—for "increases" read "increase "

Page 27, column 1, question 530, line 1—delete "Yes "

Page 27, column 1, question 535, line 3—after "I" add "— "

Page 27, column 1, question 535, line 4—for "of" read "on" (twice)

Page 27, column 1, question 542, line 13—after "perhaps" add "not "

Page 27, column 2, question 544, line 12—after "optimistic" add "about the railways "

Page 27, column 2, question 546, line 3—for "borne" read "turned "

Page 27, column 2, question 551, line 7—for "those increases" read "fare increases "

Page 28, column 1, question 564, line 8—for "lied" read "looked "

Page 29, column 1, question 585, line 1—delete "of "

Page 29, column 2, question 597, line 6—for "Harrow and inward" read "Harrow inwards "

Page 29, column 2, question 598, line 1—after "about" add "Day "

Page 29, column 2, question 608, line 5—for "we were not" read "we were "

Page 29, column 2, question 609, line 8—after "referred to" add "it "

Page 30, column 1, question 611, line 3—after "James's" add "Park "

Page 30, column 1, question 615, line 4—for "Crystallised" read "Crystallised "

Page 31, column 1, question 617, line 1—for "We could not expect" read "We should not intend "

### THIRD DAY

Wednesday, 2nd December, 1964

Page 32, column 1, question 625, line 4—for "is the line" read "is the yield "

Page 32, column 2, question 630, line 3—after "passes" add "at "

Page 32, column 2, question 631, line 2—for "or" read "and "

Page 33, column 2, question 643, line 3—for "12 miles" read "10 miles "

Page 33, column 2, question 646, line 9—for "those tickets" read "Day Return Tickets "

Page 33, column 2, question 646, line 16—for "on more than" read "no more than "

Page 34, column 1, question 661, line 7—for "persuasion" read "persuasion "

Page 34, column 2, question 678, line 10—for "they have been" read "they have done "

Page 35, column 1, question 689, line 3—for "£4-4m" read "£44-4m "

Page 35, column 2, question 704, line 8—for "be something in" read "which is attracted by fine weather so that although there may be something in "

Page 35, column 2, question 706, line 7—delete last line 7

Page 35, column 2, question 707, line 1—after "we were" add "right?—No. It is the lack of service offered on the road "

Page 35, column 2, question 708, line 4—for "loosen" read "loosen "

Page 36, column 1, question 723, line 6—for "has not been held" read "has not held "

Page 36, column 2, question 736, line 2—for "traffic of £1-2m" read "traffic on the £1-2m "

Page 37, column 1, question 747, line 2—after "charging" add "for "

Page 37, column 1, question 747, line 3—for "to do it" read "to charge single stages "

Page 37, column 2, question 752, line 3—for "difficulty" read "difficulty "

Page 38, column 1, question 779, line 8—for "pieces" read "units "

Page 38, column 2, question 790, line 2—after "three" add "Lines between "

Page 38, column 2, question 790, line 3—before "Harrow" delete "the" and add "between "

Page 38, column 2, question 790, line 3—for "Park Stations" read "Park Station "

Page 38, column 2, question 791, line 1—delete "— "

Page 39, column 1, question 797, line 5—for "off Queen's Park" read "South of Queens Park "

Page 39, column 1, question 798, line 3—for "Camborwell" read "Campbell "

Page 39, column 1, question 802, line 13—delete "— "

Page 40, column 1, line 1—delete first paragraph to "fares not exceeding" and insert "Subject to the provisions of paragraphs 8 and 10 of this Order the Board may charge for the carriage of passengers by any of their services by railway between Queen's Park Station and Watford Junction Station and between Harrow-on-the-Hill Station, and Amersham Station and upon the Watford and Chesham Branches and between Bow Road Station and Uxminster Station fares not exceeding "

Page 40, column 1, paragraph 7, line 2—after "had" insert "not "

Page 40, column 1, paragraph 7, penultimate line—after "and" insert "neither" for "or" read "neither "

Page 40, column 1, paragraph 7, last line—after "predominances" insert "have ever "

Page 40, column 2, question 810, line 4—for "on that line" read "to that line "

Page 41, column 1, question 828, line 4—for "our trains come" read "our train comes "

Page 41, column 1, question 829, line 1—for "to Uxminster Junction" read "to Campbell Road Junction "

Page 41, column 2, question 841, line 6—for "collect" read "equate"  
 Page 44, column 1, question 920, line 3—for "Marythone" read "Amersham"  
 Page 47, Exhibit RMR 2—Deviation from Budget—add to head of Col. 8 "£000"  
 Page 47, Exhibit RMR 2—Week ending 3rd February, Col. 4, for "+31" read "-31"  
 Page 48, Exhibit RMR 2—Line after 14th June to be double line  
 Page 48, Exhibit RMR 3—Add the following:—

W/E, Col. 3, Col. 4, Col. 5, Col. 7, Col. 8, Col. 9			
Nov. 1	2037	-6	-0.3
	38493	-260	-0.7
Nov. 8	1964	-22	-1.1
	40454	-282	-0.7
15	1929	-25	-1.3
	42383	-307	-0.7
22	1975	+14	+0.7
	44354	-283	-0.7
29	1977	-23	-1.2
	46335	-316	-0.7

#### FOURTH DAY

Thursday, 3rd December, 1964

Page 55, column 1—after "Mr. J. B. Hilton" add "Mr. Myer"  
 Page 56, column 1, question 970, line 2—for "between" read "below"  
 Page 56, column 1, question 975, line 1—after "Please do" add "—"  
 Page 56, column 1, question 976, line 4—space between Road and Upmaster  
 Page 56, column 2, question 983, line 2—for "throughout" read "thoroughout"  
 Page 56, column 2, question 987, line 4—delete first "then"  
 Page 57, column 1, question 990, line 2—for "Inquiry" read "Inquiry"  
 Page 58, column 1, question 1023, line 3—for "discount" read "scount"  
 Page 58, column 2, question 1036, line 8—for "the relation", read "the relationship is"  
 Page 59, column 1, paragraph 2, line 5—delete "(which we have called £20,000)" and substitute "shown"  
 Page 59, column 1, question 1043, line 1—for "£7,000" read "£37,000"  
 Page 59, column 1, question 1054, line 5—for "which is anybody" read "which if anybody"  
 Page 59, column 2, question 1056, line 6—for "groups" read "routes"  
 Page 59, column 2, question 1057, lines 6 and 7—for "I concede that it might be" read "I conceive that it would be"  
 Page 59, column 2, question 1059, line 6—for "shall" read "should"  
 Page 59, column 2, question 1060, penultimate line—for "charges of" read "charges or"  
 Page 60, column 1, question 1064, line 9—for "experiment" read "experiment"  
 Page 60, column 1, question 1070, line 6—for "difficulty" read "difficult"  
 Page 61, column 1, question 1084, line 3—insert "and" before "a good deal"  
 Page 61, column 1, question 1088, line 3—for "£53,000" read "£53,000"  
 Page 61, column 2, question 1104, line 1—for "raise" read "rise"  
 Page 61, column 2, question 1102, line 4—for "applicant" read "application"  
 Page 62, column 1, paragraph 1, line 6—for "additional" read "additional"  
 Page 62, column 1, question 1106, line 2—for "Railways" read "Railways"  
 Page 62, column 1, question 1108, line 4—for "it is paid" read "it is to be paid"  
 Page 62, column 2, question 1113, line 5—for "guage" read "guage"  
 Page 63, column 1, question 1129, line 6—for "cast" read "case"  
 Page 63, column 2, question 1128, line 3—for "years" read "years"  
 Page 63, column 1, question 1130, line 3—for "increased" read "increases"  
 Page 63, column 1, question 1132, line 3—for "refers" read "refers"  
 Page 63, column 2, question 1145, line 2—for "increased" read "increases"  
 Page 63, column 2, question 1146, line 2—for "my" read "any"  
 Page 63, column 2, question 1149, line 3—for "third" read "this"  
 Page 64, column 1, question 1165, line 4—for "I think you" read "I thought you"  
 Page 64, column 1, question 1170, line 3—for "our" read "your"  
 Page 64, column 2, question 1179, line 10—for "relevant" read "relevance"  
 Page 65, column 1, question 1202, line 2—for "Gunnarsby" read "Gunnarsbury"  
 Page 65, column 1, question 1204, line 1—for "Gunnarsby" read "Gunnarsbury"  
 Page 65, column 2, question 1210, line 2—after "Northwood" add "Hills"  
 Page 66, column 1, question 1211, line 2—after "Northwood" add "Hills"  
 Page 66, column 1, question 1216, line 9—for "which as" read "which at"  
 Page 66, column 2, question 1212, line 5—for "British Railways" read "London Transport Railways"  
 Page 67, column 2, question 1245, line 3—for "overall" read "overall"  
 Page 68, column 1, question 1252, line 2—for "declained" read "claimed"  
 Page 68, column 1, question 1252, line 3—for "introduced" read "introduced"  
 Page 68, column 2, question 1271, line 6—for "if not all" read "though not all"  
 Page 68, column 2, question 1273, line 2—for "or" read "and"  
 Page 69, column 2, question 1285, line 7—after "without" insert "a"  
 Page 69, column 2, question 1285, line 9—for "to the buses" read "from the buses"  
 Page 70, column 1, paragraph 6—for "objection" read "objection"  
 Page 70, column 1, paragraph 7, line 5—for "situation" read "situation"  
 Page 71, column 1, paragraph 4, line 4—for "understanding" read "understanding"  
 Page 71, column 1, paragraph 4, line 12—for "six" read "fix"  
 Page 72, column 1, paragraph 5, line 3—for "comes" read "comes"  
 Page 73, column 1, paragraph 2, line 1—for "is" read "is"  
 Page 73, column 1, paragraph 3, line 1—for "paragraphs" read "paragraphs"  
 Page 74, column 1, paragraph 3, line 3—for "increase" read "increases"  
 Page 74, column 2, paragraph 1, line 8—for "busmen" read "busmen"  
 Page 76, column 1, paragraph 1, line 17—for "between" read "between"  
 Page 79, Exhibit RMR 8, Appendix "A", Heading, line 5—for "Return" read "Returns"  
 Page 80, Exhibit RMR 8, Appendix "B", Other fares, column 6—"5-10" should read "0-10"  
 Page 81, Exhibit RMR 8, Appendix "C", column 7—against "5 miles" show "1%"  
 Page 81, Exhibit RMR 8, Appendix "C", column 7—against "6 miles" show "—"  
 Page 81, Exhibit RMR 8, Appendix "C", column 7—against "7 miles" show "—"  
 Page 81, Exhibit RMR 8, Appendix "C", column 6—against "12 miles" read "9066"  
 Page 82, Exhibit RMR 9, column 1—after "Ordinary and Day Return Fares" insert "(a)"  
 Page 82, Exhibit RMR 9, column 7—under "Season Tickets and Weekly Tickets (a)" insert "approx; over 6% and 1%

# FIFTH DAY

Friday, 4th December, 1964

Page 92, column 1, line 11—after "Because" read "this is"

Page 92, column 2, line 7—for "tools" read "tolls"

Page 93, column 1, line 34—for "Thus" read "This"

Page 93, column 2, line 68—delete "not"

Page 94, column 1, line 12—for "being" read "be"

Page 95, Exhibit RMR 10, Item 1(c)—insert 4s. 6d.

Page 95, Exhibit RMR 11—insert lines below All Services figures

All days on even pages, at top—for "British Transport Commission (Passenger) Charges Scheme" read "Minutes of Evidence"

# THE TRANSPORT TRIBUNAL

## THE LONDON FARES (LONDON TRANSPORT) ORDER 1965

### REASONS FOR DECISION

22nd JANUARY 1965

AND  
CORRECTIONS TO DAILY PROCEEDINGS  
30th NOVEMBER 1964 TO 4th DECEMBER 1964



LONDON: HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE  
1965

PRICE 2s. 6d. NET